

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 9, 11-12, 14-21, and 23-26 are pending in the Application and are now presented for examination. Claims 1, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 21 have been amended. Claims 6-8, 10, 13, and 22 have been cancelled, without prejudice and without disclaimer of subject matter. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 16 and 21 are independent.

On page 4 of the Office Action, Claims 1-4, 8, 11-14, 16-18, 20-21, 23 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Koyanagi *et al.* (US Publication No.: 2004/0257436 A1). Applicant respectfully traverses.

A feature of Claim 1 recites “generate view data corresponding to a plurality of views from the buffered wide angle image data, the view data including panoramic view data ... and virtual view data.” This feature is not taught, disclosed or suggested by Koyanagi.

As recited in amended Claim 1, the same buffered wide angle image data is used to create both view data: the panoramic and the virtual view data. The claimed invention generates the close up virtual view data using the same buffered wide angle image data that was used to create the panoramic view data. This presents an advantage over the prior art, as there is no need to use a separate camera to get additional data to create the virtual view. This is because the wide angle image data received and buffered is sufficient to create both view data, the panoramic and the virtual view data. There is no need to perform extra steps to collect and buffer more video data, as both data views are created from the same already buffered wide angle image data. The virtual view provides a perspective corrected view of any portion of a panoramic view, with no fisheye distortion or with substantially reduced distortion, giving the user the ability to resolve

small details of a scene. Advantageously, the panoramic view provides context for the virtual view, giving a user the capability to not lose sight as to what is happening in the monitored area outside a virtual view, even as the user zooms in on a specific event or object. To generate “the view data corresponding to a plurality of views from the buffered wide angle image data,” i.e. the panoramic view data and the virtual views data, the processor in Claim 1 determines which algorithm to use, either a virtual view transformation algorithm or a panoramic view algorithm.

In striking contrast, Koyanagi shows that “a pictured photographed by a camera ... is displayed in an operation area of a monitor.” See Abstract. A panorama picture that shows part or all of the moving range of a camera is displayed in a panorama operation area. *Id.* A user selects an area in either the operation area or the panorama operation area. *Id.* The computer then obtains data for driving the pan tilter, so that the selected area/object is displayed at the center of the operation area. *Id.* The selected object is captured directly from the pan tilter camera after mechanically controlling the pan tilter camera. ¶ [0042]-[0043], and Figure 1.

Thus, the image displayed in the operation area is not a “virtual view” transformed from wide angle data, but an actual view captured from the pan tilter camera. Koyanagi needs additional data to be collected from the camera in order to display the object selected by the user. As such, in Koyanagi, data beyond the wide angle image data is needed to display the user’s selection, i.e. the wide angle image data collected is insufficient to present a panoramic and a virtual view. Koyanagi needs the user’s input to move the camera to the selected object in order to get more information to create a view of the selected object. ¶ [0044]. Therefore, Koyanagi does not use the same already received data to create a closer view, but instead uses additional data obtained from the camera. Koyanagi therefore does not teach, disclose or suggest “generate

view data corresponding to a plurality of views from the buffered wide angle image data, the view data including panoramic view data ... and virtual view data.” Applicant respectfully asserts that Claim 1 is patentable over Koyanagi, and respectfully requests the withdrawal of this rejection.

Amended independent Claims 16 and 21 recite features similar to amended Claim 1. Specifically, Claim 16 recites the features of “generating view data corresponding to a plurality of views from the buffered data, the view data including panoramic view data ... and virtual view data.” Claim 21 recites the features of “generating view data corresponding to a plurality of views from said buffered wide-angle image data ... the view data including panoramic view data ... and virtual view data.” As discussed above with respect to Claim 1, these features are not taught, disclosed or suggested by Koyanagi. Applicant believes these claims are patentable, and respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejections to these claims.

Claims 2-4, 11-12, 14, 17-18, 20, 23 and 26 are each dependent either directly or indirectly from one or another of independent Claims 1, 16 and 21 discussed above. These claims recite additional limitations which, in conformity with the features of their corresponding independent claim, are not disclosed or suggested by the art of record. The dependent claims are therefore believed patentable. However, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

On page 9 of the Office Action, Claims 9 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koyanagi *et al.* (US Publication No.: 2004/0257436 A1) in view of Monroe (US Publication No.: 2007/0182819 A1). Applicant respectfully traverses. Claims 9 and 19 are each dependent indirectly from one or another of independent Claims 1 and 16

discussed above. These claims recite additional limitations which, in conformity with the features of their corresponding independent claim, are not disclosed or suggested by the art of record. The dependent claims are therefore believed patentable. However, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

On page 11 of the Office Action, Claims 5, 15, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koyanagi *et al.* (US Publication No.: 2004/0257436 A1) in view of Poelstra (US Patent No.: 5,563,650 A). Applicant respectfully traverses. Claims 5, 15, 24 and 25 are each dependent either directly or indirectly from one or another of independent Claims 1 and 16 discussed above. These claims recite additional limitations which, in conformity with the features of their corresponding independent claim, are not disclosed or suggested by the art of record. The dependent claims are therefore believed patentable. However, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

Of note, Applicant's undersigned representative is registered to practice before the United States Patent & Trademark Office. In accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.34 and M.P.E.P. § 405, the signature of Applicant's undersigned representative is representation that he is authorized to represent Applicant and the assignee on whose behalf he is acting.

For all of the above reasons, the claim objections are believed to have been overcome placing Claims 1-5, 9, 11-12, 14-21, and 23-26 in condition for allowance, and reconsideration and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned to discuss any matter that would expedite allowance of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to credit overpayments or charge payment of any additional fees associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 502104.

Date: February 23, 2009

Respectfully submitted,
By: /Alan M. Weisberg/
Alan M. Weisberg
Reg. No.: 43,982
Attorney for Applicant
Christopher & Weisberg, P.A.
200 East Las Olas Boulevard, Suite 2040
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301
Customer No. 70757
Tel: (954) 828-1488
Fax: (954) 828-9122
email: ptomail@cwiplaw.com

133488